



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,558	03/29/2001	R. Craig Klem	17732-2919000	5864

7590  
Edwin H Paul  
Cesari And McKenna LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210

06/24/2004

EXAMINER

MASON, DONNA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/821,558

Applicant(s)

KLEM ET AL.

Examiner

XUAN M. THAI

Art Unit

2111

## All Participants:

(1) XUAN M. THAI.

(2) Mr. Edwin Paul, Reg. No. 31,405.

## Status of Application: 71

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 17 June 2004

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Rejection applicable under 35 USC 102(a)*

Claims discussed:

1-20

Prior art documents discussed:

*"Extension of PCI Bus to 21 Slots using GTLP Transceiver" by Siegl, Chris and Klem, Craig.*


## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
XUAN M. THAI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TC2100

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Since the non-patent publication by Siegl et al. was published within one year of but before the filing date of the current patent application, and the entities are different from the instant patent application; the non-patent publication constitute as prior art under 35 USC 102(a) unless the inventor can make a showing to disqualify the publication by filing an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 establishing that the article is describing applicant's own work. An affidavit or declaration by applicant alone indicating that applicant is the sole inventor and that the others were merely working under his or her direction is sufficient to remove the publication as a reference under 35 USC 102(a). See MPEP 715.01(c) and In re Katz, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1982). Applicant's attorney indicated that he will file an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 to remove the publication of Siegl et al. as a reference under 35 USC 102(a).